

WORKING WOMEN AND FAMILY

Eddy M. Sutanto

Universitas Kristen Petra, Surabaya

ABSTRACT

Sejumlah besar wanita yang masuk dan berpartisipasi dalam angkatan kerja adalah suatu fenomena baru dan menarik. Hal ini menjelaskan tekanan baru pada pekerja-pekerja wanita dan keluarga mereka. Terdapat banyak konsekuensi bagi masyarakat sebagaimana yang terjadi pada kehidupan keluarga dan individu yang bersangkutan. Makalah ini mencoba melihat mengapa wanita masuk dalam lingkungan kerja, karakteristik mereka, perubahan-perubahan konsepsi yang terjadi, dan apakah konsekuensinya. Makalah ini juga mengajukan beberapa cara untuk menyeimbangkan wanita-wanita yang bekerja dan keluarga.

Keywords: Working women; Family; Working women vs. Family; Career development; Productivity; Job satisfaction

TRENDS IN FEMALE LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Interest in the working lives of women has grown with increases in labor force participation by women. Although it is true that women have always “worked,” until recently the economic role played by women was concentrated in “work that could efficiently be combined in the home with child care” (Bergman, 1986). Consequently the vast majority of female labor was allocated outside the market exchange of supply and demand. It has been only in the postwar period in the United States that women have entered the labor market in large numbers (Snyder, 1994).

Changes in the work patterns of women have been sudden and marked. In 1900, 21 percent of all women were employed outside the home. In 1950, that number was 29 percent, but in 1990, the female labor force participation rate was 57.5 percent. Participation rates for women aged 20 to 64 show even greater growth, from less than 20 percent in 1900, to 33 percent in 1950, to over 70 percent

in 1990. Women now make up over 45 percent of the total labor force (see Table 1). Interestingly the labor force participation of men has been falling (from 86 percent in 1948 to 76.1 percent in 1990). Much of this decline can be explained by improved retirement benefits that have encouraged early retirement. The increase in female labor force participation has offered male workers more flexibility. Changing female labor force behavior has been most marked among women of childbearing age, with most of the increase-taking place since 1960. Between 1960 and 1990, the participation rate for women aged 25 to 34 more than doubled, from 35.2 percent to 73.6 percent. For women aged 35 to 44, the rate grew by nearly 30 percent, from 42.6 percent to 76.5 percent (Snyder, 1994).

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORKING WOMEN

Who are these working women? As Alan Pifer (1979) noted that most of them, in contrast to earlier times, are married and living

with their husbands and are likely to have school-age children. By 1978, in approximately 46 million intact marriages in the nation, over 21 million of the wives were working full or part-time.

As may be expected, the second largest category of female workers, now totaling more than 15 million, is composed of individuals who are single, separated, widowed, or divorced, with divorced women showing the

highest participation rates. A large proportion of this group, furthermore, has young children, reflecting the startling fact that over the past decade families headed by women on their own have grown ten times as fast as two-parent families. In the short time from 1970 to 1973, the number of female-headed families with children rose by over a million. As March 1975, they totaled 7.2 million—one out of every eight families in the country.

Table 1. Female Labor Force Participation Rates, United States, 1900-1990

Ages	1900	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
16-19	26.6	28.4	22.8	18.9	22.6	23.9	25.5	51.5	51.8
20-24	31.7	37.5	41.8	45.6	42.9	44.9	56.3	69.2	71.6
25-34	19.3	23.7	27.1	33.3	31.8	35.2	45.2	66.2	73.6
35-44	15.7	19.2	21.7	27.2	35	42.6	50.6	66.5	76.5
45-54	15	17.9	19.7	22.5	32.9	46.7	52.9	61	71.2
55-64	13.2	14.3	15.3	16.8	23.5	35	42.4	41.1	45.3
All ages	21	22.7	23.6	25.8	29	34.5	39.9	51.8	57.5
Ages 20-64	19.7	22.9	25.4	29.4	33	40.6	49.2	61.5	70.8

Sources: Smith, J.P., & Ward, M.P. (1984)

Although the presence of the children is thought to inhibit women's labor force participation, in 1975 nearly 28 million children under the age of 18 had working mothers; of these, six and a half million were under the age of six. Mothers of almost half the children in the nation, therefore, were at work earning, or helping to earn, the family's living.

Some of the forces encouraging women into the labor force are clear enough. Among economic factors are the need to be self-supporting, unemployment husbands, the effects of inflation on family budgets, changing notions of what constitutes a decent standard of living, and accelerated demand for female labor through the growth of service and technical jobs where women have been traditionally employed. Strongly associated with women's rising labor force participation are drastically lowered fertility rates. With a

longer life span and two children increasingly the norm, many women are spending a shorter period of their lives raising children and thus have time available for the endeavors. More opportunities for post-secondary education have raised women's expectations and their qualifications for employment. Other factors are advances in household technologies, improved family health, and new legislation promoting equality of opportunity in education and in employment.

One cannot discount the impact of diminishing social prejudice against the idea of women moving out of the home into areas of public life. Credit must go to the women's movement for helping to generate a more positive climate for these changes, for giving moral support to women who do work, and for inspiring them to fight more equal treatment in the work place.

There has undoubtedly been a marked change of attitude about work on the part of younger women. Many still go through adolescence and their early twenties thinking that their future economic security will be largely dependent on the marriages they make. Increasingly, however, of this new generation are growing up believing that whatever their fate, be it a stable marriage, divorce, or remaining single, they must expect to be all or partly self-supporting, and to provide for any children they may have. This very anticipation of working is impelling more women into the labor force.

Finally, women work not only for income but, like men, because of their desire for achievement and the satisfaction that comes from using their skills and being recognized for it. This tends to be overlooked in the emphasis on economic motivation.

The following sections describe some changes that have been occurred as argued by Boulding (1979). Those changes are changing conceptions of women's role, husbands' role in the family and changing trends in family lifestyles.

CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF WOMEN'S ROLE IN THE FAMILY

The process of industrialization separated living space from space for economic productivity. Men left the home during the day for the office or factory, and women and children, for the most part, were left behind. For men, home was the refuge from toil, the setting for leisure interests, rest, and play. Women were assigned the responsibility of maintaining the home and preparing the family living space to sustain and entertain other family members. For husbands and children, the home served as leisure space; for women, it was workplace and resort, and work and leisure became inextricably mixed. Thus, the real labor involved and the considerable energy invested in work in the home was demeaned for many women.

The role of mother as keeper of the home, family leisure, and culture gained a romanticized legitimacy as the "true and appropriate" purpose of woman. This romanticization of the homemaker's role has been hardest of all for women who are single-never married, widowed, separated, or divorced. The closure of child care facilities after World War II signaled a national consensus-women's place is in the home.

Yet women have, since this time, been entering the work force in larger and larger numbers, indicating a society wide decision to re-negotiate the unwritten terms of industrial era marriage contracts which confine wives to child and housekeeping responsibilities. Whether the move is out of suburban home to a job in town or to rural acreage with demanding home production activities, women are making statements about lifestyle preferences by their actions.

Although it is irrefutable that the home maker is very truly a "working woman" and contributes substantial but unrecorded amounts of the GNP by her activity, the pattern of full-time urban homemaking does not absorb a large percentage of women's energies, particularly when children are no longer small. Many women are demanding new options for career and household responsibilities. They do not feel that their daily activities are preordained by the family "womb." Care of children can be accomplished inside or outside the home by qualified caregivers. Household responsibilities can be shared with husbands and children, to the benefit of all family members.

CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS' ROLES

Missing in here is consideration of new roles for men and improvements in the overall quality of husbands' lives. Husbands need not to be relegated to full-time labor-force participation from age 20 to retirement. Housework

shared by husbands and wives would clearly provide more opportunities for overall family interaction while both partners work and “play” in the home. Working wives relieve husbands of the sole responsibility of providing for the family unit economically. Job and career change, part-time work, and time out for child care are new options.

Men are now beginning to discover the joys of homemaking and child care. A policy of childbirth leave which permits either parent to take time at home for the first year of a newborn’s life, as now exists in Sweden, and increasing opportunities for part-time and flex-time work schedules, will help to crumble the dehumanizing aspects of a rigidly gender-based social division of labor. The dehumanization has operated equally on men and women, for both are caught in practices that do violence to their individuality. As society’s expectations become more flexible, marriages will become more comfortable, and couples can realize how many years they have to experiment with various ways of working and being at home, various ways of being with the spouse, and various ways of being with offspring well beyond the empty-nest stage. Double households spanning considerable geographic distance are part of the new flexibility. It is important to recognize that the different stages can invite different patterns without threatening the integrity of the family life space. New roles and new lifestyles can continue to develop in a healthily functioning family space up to the end of the life span.

CHANGING TRENDS IN FAMILY LIFESTYLES

A new trend is developing in the United States, which is small but meaningful in terms of new demands for a wholeness of life—a satisfying fusion of work and leisure. The rural-to-urban migration trend, ongoing throughout United States history, has now reversed itself. The net back flow to rural areas

in the South and parts of the West is small, but probably significant, in light of survey data indicating widespread preferences for rural over urban life. A Stanford Research Institute survey (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977) of voluntary simplicity preferences estimates that possibly as high as 50 percent of the population will prefer a simpler, less consumption-oriented lifestyle 50 years from now. This projection fits the scenario described by Burns of a return to a household economy with home-based production by men (suggesting that women are entering the labor force just at the wrong time), because the market economy cannot supply a satisfying lifestyle (Burns, 1975).

More labor-intensive lifestyles lead to different kinds of interdependencies and different kinds of autonomies in family life. When these interdependencies and autonomies are by choice, life satisfactions increase. Most of the world’s homemakers do not have choices; they live on farms or in villages, with kitchen gardens to care for and a variety of home production tasks, leaving them with less time to “devote” to the children than the urban employed women. The U.S. farmwomen shares with her third world sisters the long working hours. The average farm family in the U.S. harnesses its labor to far better equipment than third world families possess, but the pride in the family enterprise may not be that different. Interviews with American women also brought put very clearly the extent to which children become coworkers with their parents on the farm at a very early age, and how much pleasure these hardworking families, who have little time to “do for” one another, take in family companionship at work.

The changing conception of women’s roles and husbands’ roles in the family and trends in family lifestyles that has already been described above have and bring impacts and consequences not only to work-family relationship but also to individuals (Pifer, 1979). Many impacts will be reviewed in the following section.

CONSEQUENCES

The accelerated movement of women into the work force is allied to changes of major consequence for the nation as well as for the family and for the individual lives. First, while some strong rear guard actions are being fought, more and more Americans begin to see the full employment of women's abilities as a social and political imperative. Not only is it a national moral obligation stemming from our country's basic principles, but, more pragmatically, we are beginning to realize that the safety and prosperity of the nation will increasingly depend on the maximum use of our entire stock of human talent.

In the national economy we are seeing, with the emergence of the two-worker family, a fundamental change in the manner in which families provide for their economic welfare. The median income of a two-worker family in 1975 was \$ 17,237, compared with \$ 12,750 for a family with only one member employed. With their extra income, families in which both the husband and wife have been better able to keep pace with inflation and in some cases to increase their consumer buying power substantially. Double incomes in addition have provided some families with their only hope of meeting the cost of education children. Interestingly, wives are more likely to work if their husband's income is already in the middle range than if it is either very high or very low. This pattern has served to narrow the disparity between the wealthy and the average American family.

To discover the full effects of the shift to the two-worker family, however, one needs to look beyond the economic indicators. We can assume, for example, that once they are employed, many women achieve new dimensions of self-confidence and a sense of pride in their ability to support themselves or contribute to the support of a family. For some, the environment of work makes lives more interesting and broadens their horizons. For others, the work itself provides a sense of

accomplishment or fulfillment that care of the home alone has left unsatisfied. Although outside employment may in some instances lead to role conflicts and add strains in a woman's relationship with their husband and children, in others, it may actually serve to strengthen these ties by establishing the relationship on a more equal basis. For single woman, work can become the most important element in her existence, giving her not only the means of support but human companionship and the security of a recognized position in the community.

With more women working, age-old mores about the distinctive roles of the sexes and appropriate relationship between them are being questioned, notably by younger couples but also by others. There is now an assumption by such people that women will work and, hence, acknowledgment of the fact that household maintenance and child care must be shared by both marriages partners. Other effects on social norms and lifestyles are just beginning to be studied, and while they may not yet extend throughout the society, they are nonetheless profound.

In the workplace, many employers, increasingly concerned about job satisfaction and productivity, and also responding to pressures to recognize the dual responsibilities of women-workers for home and job, have begun to experiment with more to part-time work or with arrangements that provide flexibility in the hours of the work day or the work week. Some firms have shortened the workweek by lengthening the workday, or they have instituted flexible starting and finishing times and staggered work schedules for individual employees. The result is, at the very least, no decline in work performance. Employees of both sexes report a better balance between work and private life, and improved morale and loyalty to employers.

Businesses, in addition, are facing changing outlooks toward work in male employees who have working wives. Men in

this position are less willing to transfer from one location to another, and their unemployment rates have been higher during the recession than those of male heads of households generally. There are some indications also that men are showing a preference for shorter or more flexible work hours. We may one-day see a time when considerable numbers of men and women, whether by choice or necessity, will be nearly alike in their attitudes toward work.

Working women's organizations and other women's interest groups have been exerting more pressure on employers and government to implement equal opportunity employment and equal pay laws and to remedy the effects of past inequities through affirmative action. Awareness of the role of education in preparing women for the world of work has led to extensive legislation promoting equal educational opportunity. In 1977, to mention only one change, education institutions will be required to initiate programs to overcome sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in vocational education programs and to make all courses accessible to everyone. The entry barriers to many traditionally sex-related jobs have been crumbling, allowing a certain number of women to enter male-dominated occupations. Some employers are making sincere efforts to recruit and promote women into positions men have held in the past. Evidence shows the impact of the changes. Since 1960, the rate of increase of women in the skilled crafts has exceeded that of men. The greatest advances, however, have been made in the professions by highly educated women. Graduate and professional schools are reporting rapid rises in enrollments among women; the employment of women lawyers, physicians, dentists more than doubled between 1960 and 1970 and is still rising. Clearly some improvement has already occurred in women's employment status in the last decade or so, not all of it reflected in existing statistics.

While maternity leaves, pension and other benefit programs, and social security policies are a burning issue for women's organizations, progress has been made in these areas to reduce discrimination against women. Such progress is based on recognition of the existence of the working life and elimination of the presumption of female dependency. Part-time workers, however, the majority of whom are women, are still denied major benefits because they are not considered a permanent part of the work force. The recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court permitting the exclusion of pregnancy disabilities from an employer's disability compensation plan, and the New York State Supreme Court ruling that exclusion is unconstitutional point up, if nothing else, the need for the country to establish a coherent set of policies that reflect emerging realities and recognize the interdependence of work and family life.

Despite some favorable omens associated with women working, problems, already existing but hidden, or resulting from failure of social policy to make accommodations, have become evident. In the first place, while the addition of a wife's earnings has helped middle-income families fight inflation, and even improve their living standard, those intact families which have only one income earner, or single men or women with children, are comparatively worse off. Particularly disadvantaged is family headed by a woman on her own. Women's earnings in the aggregate are three-fifths those of men for full-time year-around work; overall, their median earned income in 1975 was only two-fifths that of men, partly because of their predominance in part-time work. The earning capacity of a female head of family is further limited because her educational attainment tends to be low. Relatively poor skills and the presence of children often make it impossible for such women to work at all. One in three female-headed families, in fact, has an income below the poverty level. Indeed, the hardship faced

by these families, whether the mother is working or is on welfare, is one of the greatest social problems the nation has today.

Second, research shows that the greatest increase recently of mental depression in the American populace has been among young, poor women who are single parents and young married mothers who work in low-level jobs. Stress and a sense that they lack the power to improve their circumstances seem to be the chief causes of low morale.

Third is the immense physical and emotional burden that dual responsibility for home and job place on both married women and single women heading families. One survey suggests that the average of employed woman put at least 26 hours per week into household duties in addition to her job, making a 66-hour working week, plus travel time. Obviously such a schedule leaves a little time or energy for organized recreation or even for simple relaxation. Role conflicts in addition can leave working women feeling guilty. While husbands are beginning to help with housework and children care, sharing of these responsibilities is still not general. For of the persistence on the part of both men and women of traditional ideas about appropriate sex roles, because of force of habits and because of the demands of some kinds of jobs held by men bring them home exhausted, too.

A fourth and crucial problem associated with women working in increased numbers is that of what happens to their children. Families today get by with various child care arrangements-hiring baby-sitters, placing their preschool youngsters in publicly supported or private daycare facilities, or leaving them with relatives, friends, or women who look after small groups children in their homes. Older children are in school part of the day, but the availability of after-school care is extremely limited. Working parents often have no alternative but to give their children the house key and hope for the best. Taken together, these measures, all of which, except possibility the

last, are adequate for some families in some circumstances, fall short of constituting a national solution to the problem. For too many, the unavailability of good, affordable care remains a chronic problem, causing anguish to parents and in some cases having a direct bearing on whether women can work at all.

We have not yet learned the full effects of all these pressures on the family, but we do know that they are most severe for lower-income wives and mothers, who are also the women with the least access to services and opportunities that might ameliorate their condition.

Finally, there are the economic consequences arising from the changing size and composition of the work force. The question is whether the large-scale entry of women-coming just at a time when the pool of potential new workers among the nation's youth is swollen as a result of the post-war baby boom and, further, when minority-group unemployment continues at about 13 percent-has greatly diminished any prospect that the country will ever achieve full employment. An apparent paradox of the past two years has been expanding number of jobs filled at a time when unemployment has also been at its highest level since the Great Depression. At present more than 88 Americans actually hold jobs and about 7.9 million are officially unemployed, making civilian labor force of about 96 million. If one adds to this a considerable number of "discouraged job seekers," we have a national labor force at the present time approaching 100 million, not counting the category of potential workers who are, at present, essentially unemployable because they lack of the necessary skills.

Manpower economists on the whole agree that young people and adult women trying to enter the labor market do not compete with each other directly for the same jobs-aside from the obvious competition between younger and older women for certain kinds of positions, especially for part-time work. Nevertheless,

the only hope that considerable numbers of young people, minority-group members, and women have of working is in those relatively unskilled jobs that permit substitution of one type of worker for another. There is therefore at least theoretical competition among them, in which it would seem that the addition of ever-greater numbers of women to the labor force—some 1.5 million just in the past year—cannot but be a complicating factor. This could become an important question for the future as we move toward greater occupational integration.

The long and the short of it is that more Americans than ever before want to work, but we have not developed the means to provide them with jobs. Whether the problem was regarded as structural or economic or both, any solution we devise will unquestionably have to reckon with the reality that women in large numbers are in the labor force to stay. The answer will not come about by inducing women to leave their jobs and stay at home “where they belong”—as if this could just be mandated or as if the majority of women and their families really had a choice under present conditions.

Laws prohibiting discrimination, promoting equal opportunity, and requiring employers to take “affirmative action” where inequalities are found are on the books, but there has been a mounting outcry among women and civil rights organizations about the slow progress being made to give these laws full effect. A major hindrance, even when employers make sincere efforts to comply with the law, seems to be the long-standing problem of occupational segregation of men and women. Many employers traditionally limit hiring for certain job categories to one sex. Such sex-typing discourages male entry into such challenging fields as nursing or teaching, but the preponderant effects is to deny women training, job opportunities and wages commensurate with those of men. A high proportion of the jobs that are open to women are in the marginal, low-paid, low-status areas generally lacking in

opportunities for advancement. And while more women are entering male-dominated occupations, their numbers remain relatively small, and limitations on their upward mobility are still prevalent.

The areas of greatest job expansion for women continue to be in certain kinds of technical and professional occupations and in clerical and service jobs. This employment is mainly in government at all levels, particularly in educational, health, and welfare services, and in banking and insurance. Most women go into white-collar jobs, more than one-third of them in bookkeeping, secretarial, typing, and clerical work. The rest are in blue-collar factory and farm jobs (18 percent) and in service work (21 percent).

A high proportion of the women holding jobs in these areas do not receive wages commensurate with the level of responsibility or skill demanded of them. This widespread under valuation of their work goes far to explain why women earn only three-fifths as much as men.

Other reasons for women’s lower earnings may have to do with employers’ complaints that women are less skilled than men or are less motivated to try for those jobs that lead to advancement. This is a question more of public attitudes and the educational system, they say, than of anything that goes on in the workplace. There is also the prevailing belief among employers that women’s work attachment is intermittent, making it a poor investment to train them for greater responsibility. Many women do drop out of the labor force temporarily to have children, or they find that their home responsibilities allow them to work only part-time. Nevertheless, their total time in the labor force has risen dramatically—from an average of six years in 1900 to 22.9 years today (compared with 40.1 years for men). In spite of this, the myth of women’s work instability has helped to keep them in those low-earning, dead-end jobs that seem structured to fulfill the very prophecy that provides

employers the excuse not to train them for better positions.

Incredible as it may seem, the average wage differential between men and women is wider today than it was 20 years ago, even though the educational attainment of working women has reached that of men, women's work-life expectancy has risen greatly, and more women are securing higher-level and better-paying positions. Beyond the continuation of some outright discrimination, one can only speculate on the causes. One reason may be that a larger proportion of female than male workers are working at, or near, entry levels of pay. Another may be that, as more women work or look for work in the traditional "female" fields, the more they come into direct competition with one another, allowing employers pay them less. It must be remembered that, despite women's rush into the labor force, their unemployment rate is still higher than that of men.

All of these factors serve to restrict severely women's chances of upward mobility in employment and hence increased earnings—a situation that is particularly unfair to the substantial, and growing, proportion of women who do remain in the labor force full-time from entry until retirement.

Another consequence of the increasing labor force participation of women is a decline in the number of women available for traditional community voluntary activities—in schools, health care facilities, churches, and welfare organizations. Women and men who have reached retirement age, are still in good health, and want to remain contributing members of society will possibly make up the difference. Some successful experiments with retirees suggest this will not be too hard to do, but it will take time.

To sum up, on the favorable side there are signs that American society is accepting the philosophy, legal, and pragmatic rationales for the full employment of women's talents in the

workplace. The rights of women are specifically protected by legislation and by presidential executive orders, and will be further reinforced by passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. Women have made some advances in their employment status, and the benefits to the nation are evident—in added family income, in a stronger national economy, and in improved service to the public. There is also evidence that greater equality at home and in the workplace is giving women increased confidence and a greater sense of efficacy. Finally, there are indications that institutions are beginning to recognize the special problems of the working woman and to make some needed adjustments.

There are other aspects of women working, however, attributable mainly to society's failure to accommodate rapidly enough to their needs that are cause for concern. Women are frequently the victims at work of occupational segregation the law seems powerless to affect, suffer from low earnings, and have limited opportunity for advancement. Large proportions of women heading families live in poverty, with virtually no chance to improve their circumstances. The heavy burden implicit in women's dual responsibility for home and job has not been sufficiently eased by a sharing of housework and child care on the part of men. The unavailability of child care during working hours of parents remains a major problem.

In a more speculative vein, new stresses in the lives of women with children, caused by divided loyalties to family and career, may be giving rise to physical and emotional problems and adding strains to family life. The kinds of studies necessary to understand these problems fully have not been yet done and should be given high priority in the future.

Finally, although the ultimate consequence of women working in such large numbers should be beneficial both to the economy and the nature of American society, there are likely, in the shorter run, to be disturbances

and special problems in the labor market before employment generally adjusts to the new phenomenon.

WORK – FAMILY BALANCE

According to demographic and lifestyle changing in American families described above, there are needs to balance the relationship between work and family. As mentioned before that there are many conflicts occurred in relationship between work and family when the larger of women go into the workplace. Mostly the problems are experienced and faced by two-worker families (Isaacson, 1995). Many experts (Hansen, 1991; Schwartz, 1992; Isaacson, 1995; Boulding, 1979) suggest that to achieve the balance situation between the both, each parties have to try to make some adjustments in order to fulfill their own goals.

Many strategies for solving the problems faced by two-worker families are already beginning to appear. These include job-sharing, in which two people divide the responsibilities of a single job, and the development of home-based work centers in which the individual, using technology such as computers, fulfills the job requirements at home rather than at office. Other strategies include maternity and paternity leave, creation of child care centers at places of work, year-round school programs, and flexible work schedule (Isaacson, 1995). In the other words, the workplace needs to become more family-friendly (Schwartz, 1992).

While Hansen (1991) suggests a model that is called the integrative life patterns (ILP). The ILP model indicates the need for changes in the workplace, changes in the family, and changes in the society. It also promotes greater awareness of the interactive nature of work, marriage, and family. It reflects the need for changes in our socialization as to what women and men and boys and girls do and can do. It emphasizes the need for changes in our stereotypes about men's and women's roles

and the occupational sex segregation which results from the stereotyping. It reflects the need for change in our institutional structures and policies to facilitate the new work/family linkage and to free roles of both men and women to help resolve the common problems facing our communities, our nation and our planet. It provides vision of women and men as equal partners at home and in the workplace being empowered to develop their multiple roles, meeting their needs for achievement and connectedness, with satisfaction to self and family, to the relationship, and with benefit to the workplace. Integrative Life Patterning provides a vision of both men and women enabled to become self-sufficient and connected, to become autonomous yet in relationship, independent yet interdependent. It images society in which women and men are both nurturers and achievers, integrating the agent and the communal in their own lives, and where children are provided models of women and men being able to many things which they also can do.

CONCLUSION

As Hansen (1991) pointed out, changes in the American family and changes in the American workplace are real, as also are the demographics of men and women in these workplaces and families. However, creative changes will need to occur in education, career development and guidance, in family, in work structures, and in other institutions of society.

If we eliminate gender as the primary determinant of the assignment of work/family roles, when women workers are parents either parent can be free to choose the caretaker/nurturer role. This choice will not be framed by learned gender constructs, but rather by factors not tied to sex or gender. Women no longer must prove themselves "as good as any man." To achieve balance, men must reconsider the norms that have structured their lives and be willing to risk striving for a new kind of

equality. Individuals, children, and families can thrive under this new structure. To fulfill the ideals of equality, our goal should be to find a way to create symmetry in the lived out experiences of all members of the community. Men and women will never be identical, but their lives can be in equilibrium.

REFERENCE

- Apter, T. (1994). *Working Women Don't Have Wives*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Bergman, B.R. (1986). *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boulding, E. (1979). Family Wholeness: New Conceptions of Family Roles. In Feinstein, K.W., *Working Women and Families* (pp. 277-291). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Burns, S. (1975) Home, Inc.: The hidden Wealth and Power of the American Household. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Carp, F.M. (1991). *Lives of Career Women: Approaches to Work, Marriage, Children*. New York: Insight Books, Platinum Press.
- Dubeck, P.J., & Borman, K. (1997). *Women and Work*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Elgin, D. & A. Mitchell. (1977). *Voluntary Simplicity* (3). The CoEvolution Quarterly 14.
- Fame, M. & Wilker, N. (1979). *Up Against the Clock, Career Women Speak on the Choice to Have Children*. New York: Random House.
- Feinstein, K.W. (1979). *Working Women and Families*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Hansen, L.S. (1991). *Integrative Life Planning: Work, Family, Community*. *Futurics*: Vol. 15, No. 3 & 4.
- Isaacson, L.E. (1995). *Basics of Eager Counseling*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Pifer, A. (1979) Women Working: Toward a New Society. In Feinstein, K.W., *Working Women and Families* (pp. 277-291). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, F.N. (1992). Breaking With Tradition Women and Work, the New Facts of Life. In Bookspan, P.T., *A Delicate Imbalance – Family and Work*. Texas Journal of Women and the Law: Vol. 5:37, 1995.
- Snyder, N.M. (1994). Career Women in Perspective: The Wichita Sample. In Konek, C.W. & Kitch, S.L., *Women & Career* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.